

December 7, 1955

Dr. P. R. Edwards  
Box 185  
Chamblee, Ga.

Dear Phil:

I am getting around again to writing up the genetics of *S. paratyphi* B #137. As you suggested, I will put it all together before sending you a copy for any amendments (including authorship) that you may see fit to propose. Meanwhile, I wonder if you could look over the bracketed material on the enclosure and tell me if you can add anything to the story. According to my notes, N97b was received here initially with the label "AMS", which I assume means Army Medical Service-- is there anyone at Walter Reed who might be able to add to the history?

A couple of years ago you also mentioned that you had other cultures from the same outbreak. I did not see much point then of studying duplicates and I am not really in a mood or position right now to do more experiments. However, for possible future studies, it would relieve me to know that these other cultures were safe in lyophil or otherwise being watched over. If not, but you still have them in a less secure form, I will be glad to accept responsibility for a few of them.

Is it appropriate to use the form "CDC-157" or should I use a prefix like "Ky." or "Edwards"? I hate to use a bare number.

I read the discussion in your paper, as requested. I can't see why Kauffmann should be irked, and if he relies on transducing two markers (are they Fla and H antigens?)(he evidently does not understand transduction genetics very well. If he is referring to the O antigens, I am quite unconvinced that this is a transduction. On the other hand, I don't see why there should be much fuss about the quantitative efficiencies of transduction in comparisons of widely different phages. Even with PLT22, we see wide variations when different recipients are used. To call this kind of discrepancy a "direct contrast" seems hyperbolic, but a personally privileged opinion. The main reason I hesitate to bring up the 5-antigen story is that I don't feel I understand it. There is definitely not enough evidence to prove this is a transduction (i.e., in terms of the specificity of different donors); I have a feeling it is more closely related to the story of Uetake et al. in E<sub>1</sub>-E<sub>2</sub> changes. Dr. Ellen Simon (who visited you recently) hopes to do some more work to try to clarify the genetics of 5. By the way, has the agreement to suspend naming *Salmonella* serotypes been suspended? There seems to be some inconsistency in adherence to it. I hope that the recent use of arabic numerals for the somatic antigens eventually goes by the board too, or else some convention for clearly distinguishing them from the flagellar.

Sincerely,

Joshua Lederberg